Fiscal Estimate - 2005 Session

Original Updated	Corrected Si	upplemental							
LRB Number 05-3233/1	Introduction Number SB-	428							
Description Prohibiting certain state agencies or any city, village, town, or county from using the word squaw in the name of a public place, highway, or geographic feature									
Fiscal Effect									
Appropriations Rev	ease Existing enues rease Existing renues Increase Costs - M to absorb within ag Yes Decrease Costs								
Local: ☐ No Local Government Costs ☐ Indeterminate ☐ 1. ☐ Increase Costs ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory ☐ Districts ☐ Districts ☐ Districts									
Fund Sources Affected GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS 20.395 (3)(eq)									
Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature	Date							
DOT/ Richard Moss (608) 267-7830	12/12/2005								

Fiscal Estimate Narratives DOT 12/12/2005

LRB Number 05-3233/1	Introduction Number	SB-428	Estimate Type	Original			
Description Prohibiting certain state agencies or any city, village, town, or county from using the word squaw in the name of a public place, highway, or geographic feature							

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

- 1. There would be very few DOT signs affected and the fiscal impact would be minimal. Specifically, analysis from the DOT SignView Oracle database reveals only one state sign (Squaw Creek). Adopt-a-Highway (AAH)signs are not in the system, but no AAH signs have the word "squaw." Total sign change costs would be approximately \$500.
- 2. DOT mapping staff estimate \$500 costs to update state maps to remove the word "squaw." This cost added to the \$500 described above would make the total cost approximately \$1000.
- 3. It is difficult to attribute a local fiscal effect to the statutory changes which would result from this legislation. DOT does not have a database of all geographic names in the state. This estimate assumes the costs for any single local government would not be significant, but it is reasonable to assume similar local costs are mandatory to comply with the mandate of this bill, including changing signs, map references, and affected documents. It is possible the majority of time would be spent on deciding on replacement names.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

The long-range implications are minimal.

Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2005 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

	Original		Updated			Corrected		Supplemental
LRB	Number	05-3233/	/1		Intro	duction Nu	umber	SB-428
Descr i Prohib the na	oiting certain s	state agencies c place, highw	or any city vay, or geoç	, villag graphic	e, town,	, or county fro	m using th	ne word squaw in
annua There	alized fiscal e	effect): 000 in state co					·	o not include in
	nualized Cos				Annualized Fiscal Impact on funds from:			
						Increased Cos		Decreased Costs
A. Sta	te Costs by (Category		4.1	.÷			
70.00		- Salaries and	d Fringes				\$	
(FTE	E Position Cha	anges)						
State	e Operations	- Other Costs	;				0	**************************************
Loca	al Assistance							
Aids	to Individuals	s or Organizat	tions					
T	OTAL State (Costs by Cate	egory				\$0	\$
B. Stat	te Costs by S	Source of Fu	nds					·
GPF	1							· ·
FED				55.5 N 69.7		A. w	a an Jakes area a gr	The second secon
PRC)/PRS					Light of the goal of the control of		
SEG	G/SEG-S (0)						0	
III. Stat	te Revenues ues (e.g., tax	s - Complete t increase, de	his only w crease in l	hen pricense	roposal e fee, et	s.)		
Lopp	Tavas					Increased Re		Decreased Rev
	R Taxes						\$	\$
FED	REarned							
	D/PRS G/SEG-S			_			_	
		3		-			_	_
	OTAL State F		-T ANNUL				\$	\$
		N	IET ANNUA	LIZEL) FISCA		. T	
NET CI	LANCE IN C	OCTO				Sta		Local
NET CHANGE IN COSTS NET CHANGE IN REVENUE				\$0 ©	\$			
NEI O	TANGE IN DI	EVENUE					\$	\$
Agenc	y/Prepared B	Зу		Autho	orized S	ignature		Date
				(608) 267-37	'03	12/12/2005		